

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/717,305	11/18/2003	Toshie Imai	MIPFP066	6467	
25920 7590 01/09/2008 MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP 710 LAKEWAY DRIVE			EXAMINER		
			PARK, CHAN S		
SUITE 200 SUNNYVALE, CA 94085		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2625		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/09/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•	10/717,305	IMAI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
•	CHAN S. PARK	2625			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap					
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 136(a): In no event, however; may a reply to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS te, cause the application to become ABAND	TON. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 N	November 2007.				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ Thi	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	cepted or b) objected to by t	he Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		·			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Appli prity documents have been rec au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage			
DOUGLAS Q.TRAN					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	AMINER	S. Pare			
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Ma				

10/717,305 Art Unit: 2625

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 11/1/07, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-8** are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gignac U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0239982 in view of Fujita U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0067511.

3. With respect to claim 1, Gignac teaches an image processing method (abstract), comprising the steps of:

providing image data stored in a user's PC (paragraph 38, lines 1-2), and image production record information related to the image data (figs. 11~13), wherein the image production record information is produced by the user's PC (figs. 11~13); and

10/717,305 Art Unit: 2625

executing a trimming process upon determining whether or not to trim the image data based on the image production record information (paragraphs 57~60).

Gignac, however, does not explicitly teach that the user's PC produces the image data.

Fujita, the same field of the image processing/modifying method using the user's PC, teaches the method of producing/generating image data at the user's PC (host computer generating graphic data using the application program 52 in paragraph 0048).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the user's PC of Gignac to include the application program 52 for generating the image data as taught by Fujita.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to apply the trimming/printing processes on the image data that is generated by the host computer as well as the digital camera.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gignac with Fujita to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

4. With respect to claim 2, Gignac teaches the image processing method according to claim 1, wherein

the image production record information includes at least exposure program information (either 'landscape' or 'portrait' in figs. 11~13) and photograph scene information ('letterbox' in figs. 11~13), and

10/717,305 Art Unit: 2625

the trimming process is executed when the exposure program information and photograph scene information meet specific conditions (figs. 11~13 & paragraphs 57~60).

5. With respect to claim 3, Gignac teaches the image processing method according to claim 2, wherein

the specific conditions include selection of a normal program which is set as default for the exposure program information (fig. 11), and selection of a standard scene which is set as default for the photograph scene information (fig. 11 or 13 & paragraph 57).

6. With respect to claims 6 and 8, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable.

Claims 1 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,765,691 (hereinafter Kubo) in view of Fujita.

7. With respect to claim 1, Kubo teaches an image processing method (figs. 4 & 14), comprising the steps of:

providing image data stored in a user's PC (col. 12, lines 13-21), and image production record information related to the image data (parameters set in fig. 10), wherein the image production record information is produced by the user's PC (col. 23, lines 50-61); and

executing a trimming process upon determining whether or not to trim the image data based on the image production record information (col. 23, lines 50-61).

10/717,305 Art Unit: 2625

Kubo, however, does not explicitly teach that the user's PC produces the image data.

Fujita, the same field of the image processing/modifying method using the user's PC, teaches the method of producing/generating image data at the user's PC (host computer generating graphic data using the application program 52 in paragraph 0048).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the user's PC of Kubo to include the application program 52 for generating the image data as taught by Fujita.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to apply the trimming/printing processes on the image data that is generated by the host computer as well as the digital camera.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kubo with Fujita to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

8. With respect to claim 4, Kubo teaches the image processing method according to claim 1,

wherein the image production record information includes at least subject area information (image range in col. 23, line 62 ~ col. 24, line 7) representing a subject area in an image; and

the trimming process is terminated when the subject area will be cut as a result of the trimming (automatically reducing within the range of the image instead of trimming the image according to col. 23, line 65 ~ col. 24, line 7).

10/717,305 Art Unit: 2625

9. With respect to claim 5, Kubo teaches the image processing method according to claim 1, wherein

the trimming process is a process in which an image is enlarged or reduced, while preserving an aspect ratio, to a size encompassing a designated image output size, and portions extending outside the image output size are cut off (parameters set in figs. 10 & 14 & col. 23, lines 50-61).

10. With respect to claims 6~8, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 5, are applicable. The system of Kubo outputs the image according to the image data processed by the image information processor (fig. 14 of Kubo).

Conclusion .

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

10/717,305

Art Unit: 2625

Page 7

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S. PARK whose telephone number is (571) 272-7409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DOUGLAS Q.TRAN PRIMARY EXAMINER Chan S. Park Examiner Art Unit 2625

csp December 31, 2007 Translow

Lhan S. Para